## BEFORE THE KANSAS DENTAL BOARD

In the Matter of	)	Case No.	06-65
	)	Case No.	06-66
BRADLEY R. JENKINS, D.D.S.	)	Case No.	06-0789-7195
Kansas License No. 7195	_)		

# STIPULATION AND FINAL AGENCY ORDER

IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED by and between the Kansas Dental Board (the "Board") and Bradley R. Jenkins, D.D.S. (the "Respondent") as follows:

- 1. The Board is represented herein by its attorney, Randall J. Forbes of Frieden & Forbes, 555 South Kansas Avenue, Suite 303, Topeka, Kansas 66603. The Respondent is represented herein by his attorney, Randall J. Forbes of Frieden & Forbes, 555 South Kansas Avenue, Suite 303, Topeka, Kansas 66603. The Respondent is
- 2. The Board is the Kansas agency vested with the authority, pursuant to K.S.A. 74-1404 and K.S.A. 74-1406, to carry out and enforce the provisions of the Kansas Dental Law, K.S.A. 65-1401 *et seq.*, including conducting hearings and proceedings to revoke, suspend or otherwise discipline a Kansas license to practice dentistry.
- 3. The Respondent is presently entitled to engage in the practice of dentistry in the State of Kansas by reason of the Board having issued him Kansas license number 7195. At all times relevant hereto, the Respondent has held a current license to engage in the practice of dentistry in the State of Kansas.

RECEIVED

MAR 0 9 2007

Kansas Dental Board

- 4. The Board has received certain information, has investigated and has determined that there are reasonable grounds to believe that the Respondent has committed an act or acts in violation of the Kansas Dental Act, K.S.A. 65-1401 *et seq*.
- 5. Respondent hereby admits and waives any further proof in this or any other proceeding before or initiated by the Board that:

### CASE NUMBER 06-65

- A. On or about September 26, 2002, the Licensee attempted a root canal on tooth #10 of Patient C.F.
- B. The Licensee was unable to locate the canal, but continued to place a post into the vital tooth to help in stabilizing the crown that was eventually placed. The patient record does not indicate that the Licensee made a referral to an endodontist for evaluation after his inability to locate the root canal.
- C. On or about March 7, 2003, the Licensee had an x-ray of the tooth taken, which revealed apical pathosis, disease at the tip of the root. The patient record does not indicate that the Licensee either treated the apical pathosis or made a referral to an endodontist for evaluation or the diagnosis of apical pathosis.
- D. At some point between September 2002 and March 2003, the Licensee placed a new post into the vital tooth. The patient record does not indicate the placement of the new post or the diagnosis of apical pathosis.
- E. Under the circumstances of this case, the Licensee's failures to make a referral to an endodontist and to diagnose the disease at the tip of the root constitute deviations from the applicable standard of care.

2

RECEIVED

MAR 0 9 2007

F. Under the circumstances of this case, the Licensee committed recordkeeping violations in that he failed to document a referral, if any, to an endodontist, and he failed to document the replacement post placed between September 2002 and March 2003.

#### **CASE NUMBER 06-66**

- G. On or about March 18, 2003, the Licensee placed a seven-unit bridge from tooth #21 to tooth #27 of Patient M.C.
  - H. The bridge had two abutments, #21 and #27.
- I. Under the circumstances of this case, the design of the bridge and subsequent placement constitute deviations from the applicable standard of care.

### **CASE NUMBER 06-0789-7195**

- J. On or about November 6, 2002, the Licensee performed a root canal on tooth #18 of Patient K.B.
- K. On or about May 22, 2003, the Licensee performed a crown build-up and crown preparation for Patient K.B.
- L. At some point in June 2003, the Licensee cemented the crown on tooth #18.
  - M. The insert of the crown is not recorded in the patient record.
- N. A radiograph from 2006 shows that the crown margin was significantly short of covering the build-up material and leakage was allowed into the build-up, under the crown, and not corrected. Under the circumstances of this case, the Licensee's root canal, build-up, and crown preparation constitute deviations from the applicable standard of care.

RECEVED

MAR 0 9 2007